



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/380,731	07/13/00	RET TENMAIER	J 017309/0173
------------	----------	--------------	---------------

FOLEY & LARDNER
3000 K STREET NW SUITE 500
PO BOX 25696
WASHINGTON DC 20007-8696

IM52/0410

EXAMINER

KIM, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

15

DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/380,731

Applicant(s)

Rettenmaier

Examiner

John Kim

Group Art Unit

1723

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 1, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 15-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1723

1. Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,866,242 (hereinafter referred to as Tan et al.). Tan et al teach wood pulp fibers subjected to a dilute alkali metal salt solution at a temperature of from 15 to about 60 degree Celsius and including organic particulates and filter active fractions (see col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 7; col. 4, line 58 - col. 5, line 12). Claims 1-2 and 8-9 essentially differ from Tan et al in reciting finely divided wood particles. Wood pulp contains wood fibers, and wood fibers have wood particles. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to treat wood particles in wood pulp to provide an adsorbent material as suggested by Tan et al.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,288,462 (hereinafter referred to as Hou et al '462) in view of Tan et al. Hou et al '462 teaches filter media sheet comprising cellulose fibers of different pulps or differently beaten pulps and perlite and silica (i.e. kieselguhr) (see col. 3, line 54 - col. 4, line 26; col. 5, line 6 - col. 6, line 36; col. 10, line 64 - col. 11, line 12). Hou et al '462 teach that filter sheet made of cellulose fibers are free of extractables and are free of discoloration (see col. 3, lines 59-69). Claims 1-12 essentially differ from the filter media sheet of Hou et al '462 in reciting claimed treated finely divided wood particles. Tan et al teach wood pulp fibers subjected to a dilute alkali metal salt solution at a temperature of from 15 to about 60 degree Celsius and including organic particulates and filter active fractions (see col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 7; col. 4, line 58 - col. 5, line 12). Cellulose pulp contains cellulose fibers, and cellulose fibers have cellulose particles. Cellulose is derived from wood particles. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 1723

to treat wood particles to produce cellulose pulp for its use in a filter media sheet in Hou et al '462.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,488,969 (hereinafter referred to as Hou) in view of Tan et al. Hou teaches filter media sheet comprising cellulose fibers (such as wood pulp, cotton, cellulose acetate or rayon) of different pulps or differently beaten pulps in fiber diameter of 15 to 25 microns and fiber length of about 0.85 mm and perlite and silica (i.e. kieselguhr) (see col. 3, lines 13-27; col. 4, line 57 - col. 5, line 55; col. 9, lines 57-64). Claims 1-14 essentially differ from the material of Hou in reciting claimed treated finely divided wood particles. Tan et al teach wood pulp fibers subjected to a dilute alkali metal salt solution at a temperature of from 15 to about 60 degree Celsius and including organic particulates and filter active fractions (see col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 7; col. 4, line 58 - col. 5, line 12). Wood pulp contains cellulose fibers, and cellulose fibers have cellulose particles. Cellulose is derived from wood particles. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to treat wood particles to produce wood pulp for its use in a fibrous media in Hou.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,599,240 (hereinafter referred to as Thompson). Thompson teaches cellulose fibers produced from wood chips cooked and digested at an elevated temperature with a mixture of sodium hydroxide and sodium sulfite solution (see col. 2, lines 7-17). "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the

Art Unit: 1723

process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1723


7. This application contains claims 15-35 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 7. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-2350. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached on (703) 308-0457. The fax phone number for official response after final action is (703) 305-3599, and the fax phone number for all other official faxes is (703) 305-7718.

When sending a draft amendment by fax, please mark the paper as "DRAFT"; otherwise, mark the paper "OFFICIAL". This will expedite the processing of the paper.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.


John Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

J. Kim
April 6, 2001